

October 16, 1967

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290068-9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13451

My own research in the 1950's showed that, with a few notable exceptions, businessmen avoided race relations civic activities because they were called "too controversial". If the subject was "too controversial" then, a decade ago, what has it become now? I am convinced that business know-how and resources could have helped to prevent what has now become a crisis of sharply polarized attitudes. What will race relations be in another ten years, especially if business executives do not study and deeply involve themselves in the problem we all share? (Study and involvement will require much catchup.) Listening to a few Negro spokesmen—whether militant or moderate—or reading a few books will not suffice.)

Another area in which businessmen should consider taking certain risks is higher education. For example, a contribution to a college might just be accompanied by the mild question: What are the broad social, economic, and political consequences of what you are teaching?

As a former professor, I can think of no single act better calculated to arouse a professor's rage than to ask him if his work is good for the country. While it is barely possible that some silent university president or a harried dean or two might secretly admit, in the privacy of a locked room, that it could be wise to evaluate what is being taught, the tenured professors would surely cry "academic freedom" and a war of words would commence. (One can imagine the headlines in some other newspaper: "Detroit News Stifles Academic Freedom", or "Publisher Urges Thought Control".)

But is this not astounding? Is it not remarkable that an activity as vital to the preservation of the nation as higher education should be regarded as almost the exclusive province of the educators? Can we imagine a lawyer saying that only he could define the substance of the law; that judges, legislators, or the public must stay away? Can we imagine a policeman saying that no civilian could question his personal interpretation of the criminal statutes?

The professor has several legitimate answers. One is that while other people provide practical services, the scholar searches for truth. Only the scholar possesses the skills and standards required to test for the truth. Now this is doubtless correct when disconfirming a theory of physics, or identifying the authorship of a sonnet. But it would be nonsense—and probably a contradiction of his own political faith—for a political scientist to declare that he had a monopoly on political truth—or on how to discover it.

Another professorial retort is that the scholar must not be harassed for expressing unpopular views. It is just here that the most difficult judgments must be made. Where is the proper boundary between what one man calls "harrassment" but another man calls orderly consideration of the goals of higher education? Where is the proper balance to be struck between the scholar's unquestioned need to speculate with impunity and the nation's need for some degree of moral and social cohesiveness?

If we reconsider our own history, we recall that free public secondary education was really invented in the United States in order to solve a grave social problem of the 1800's. The problem was to teach masses of immigrant children something of English, of ways to make a living, and of behavior appropriate to Americans. It was a case of designing education to achieve a purpose, then recruiting people to do the educating. Contrast this case with what we sometimes see today: we begin with college professors and design courses and curricula around their professional, personal and—I must add—political interests.

By now, you have surely gotten my point. It is very controversial for a citizen to question the substance of the higher education

system for which he is partly paying. But does this make sense? Would it not be worthwhile to accept the controversy once in a while?

Corporate contributions to other activities could also be followed by tough questions. When the welfare agency distributes benefits, does it stimulate or discourage job-seeking? How do we really know? Are the recipients actually being induced to adopt middle-class standards of behavior? But is this not partly our goal? Does the program for Negro youth provoke racist attitudes as it tries to build Negro pride? Is this necessary? There are many more questions to be asked.

Like most Americans, business people have tended not only to avoid controversy but to defer to "experts". In the matters we have considered, this has meant that they have often abandoned their own judgments in favor of those who appeared to possess superior technical knowledge. Thus, professional welfare men, professional educators, professional civic workers, and professional community relations people have guided the substance of programs vital of all of us.

Now a healthy respect for expertise is certainly wise. Surely professional experts are best able to provide technical knowledge of technical matters.

However, business deference to experts in social, economic, and political matters has sometimes gone beyond delegation to abdication. At times businessmen defer to the experts when what is really needed is their own judgment, wisdom, prudence, or a general sense of purpose, direction and propriety.

While it is probably true that only a chemist, for example, is qualified to predict what will happen when two reagents are mixed, it is manifestly not true that only an academic sociologist is qualified to express a preference about what should happen in a difficult social problem. Quite the contrary, a strong case can be made that people best qualified to set goals for a community are the people most intimately involved in its daily practical life. Obviously it would be arrogant nonsense to suggest that this group is composed solely of businessmen. It includes executives of all sorts: Politicians, government officials, trade union officers, interest group executives, educational administrators, and many more. But it would be equal nonsense to accept the idea that somehow businessmen are not qualified to play a vital part in the question-asking and goal-setting process. They should not retreat from the controversy that really active participation and questioning would produce.

It is time to start asking the questions no one asks. It is time to stop assuming that someone else knows more about what is good for your community than you do.

v

We have seen that unequalled prosperity, huge college enrollments, growing respect for intellectuals, improvements for Negroes, and television have combined to produce a national mood of self-criticism. We have suggested that too much self-criticism can be injurious. We have implied that if the critics and their criticisms are put into proper perspective, and if enough time can elapse, men of good will can solve the problems we face.

At a time in our history when people seem closer to anger, more prone to disagree, and when they are more critical of each other than ever before, we need leadership at least as much as we need criticism. We need people who can calmly synthesize reasoned actions as much as we need analysts of theories. We need men who can do much more than take ideas apart; we need men who can get people together.

Businessmen are not, of course, the only ones who fit this description. But they are among those who fit it. Human leadership remains one of the highest of the arts. The

successful businessman surely knows something of that art. There is much more he can do in our joint effort to build better communities and a better nation.

THE 1967 SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Prof. Helen M. Wallace, chairman of the division of maternal and child health at the University of California in Berkeley, commenting on the provisions of H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

I feel her comments deserve careful consideration for she is deeply interested and highly qualified in the public health field. In addition to her services at the university, Professor Wallace has served in administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children in the New York City health department and for the U.S. Children's Bureau. She has also been active in the American Public Health Association.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Wallace both compliments and constructively criticizes this legislation. I commend her letter to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, Berkeley, Calif., September 26 1967.  
Hon. JEFFERY COHELAN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to some proposed federal legislation and some federal reorganization of services for mothers and children.

My background is relevant to the comments in this letter. I am a certified specialist in both Pediatrics and Public Health. I worked for twelve years in key administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children, including handicapped children, in the New York City Health Department. I have been the Chairman of the Department of Preventive Medicine in a medical school in New York City. I was at one time on the staff of the U.S. Children's Bureau. I have held elective and appointive positions in the American Public Health Association, and have served on advisory committees to programs in the federal government and to a number of voluntary agencies serving the handicapped.

My specific comments for your consideration are as follows:

1. H.R. 12080 has a number of desirable features in it

(a) The provisions of additional funds for the extension and improvement of general health services for mothers and children.

(b) The consolidating into a single program of the programs for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children, and the eventual inclusion of Programs of Maternity and Infant Care, of Children and Youth, and for Dental Care.

(c) The support of programs designed to recruit and train professional personnel, and subprofessional aides.

(d) The support of programs of research in the field of Maternal and Child Health and to Crippled Children. Training of competent personnel to conduct such research is essential.

(e) The emphasis on training for productive employment of adult family members receiving public assistance.

H13452

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 16, 1967

(f) The provision of day care for children of working mothers.

H.R. 12080 does have several detrimental provisions or limitations in it, which need further consideration:

1. The fact that it combines appropriations for maternal and child health and crippled childrens programs, while the recent reorganization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare separates the administration of these programs.

2. There is need to require that steps be taken to assure *high quality* care of children and youth under Title 19 programs. Our observations indicate that while the cost of Title 19 programs is likely to increase, there have been no safeguards developed to assure that the children and youth will receive the kinds and quality of services needed, such as has been provided in the past by the Crippled Children Programs under the Childrens Bureau.

3. The restriction in the latest draft of H.R. 12080, placing a limitation on the proportion of children who can be included in AFDC (Aid To Families With Dependent Children) Programs. If we truly believe that children represent the future of our country, it is inconceivable that some of the children from the most deprived families requiring the most assistance will be intentionally prevented from securing it.

The situation in regard to the reorganization of federal services for mothers and children is even more distressing.

1. I believe that MCH (Maternal and Child Health) and CC (Crippled Childrens) Services are inseparable at the *local* level, where one delivers care to mothers and children. MCH and CC Services are intertwined to primary and secondary prevention, in providing continuous health supervision to stimulate case finding of handicapped children and in providing continuous health supervision to provide long term care of handicapped children. Also, school health services provide health care to "well children", children suspected of health problems, and handicapped children. To separate MCH and CC Services means the likelihood of fragmentation and some duplication.

2. I believe at the federal level there is need for one strong centralized agency which will be the health and social agency for mothers and children, and will be the spokesman for mothers and children of our country. I believe that the reorganization will weaken rather than strengthen this.

3. I believe that the reorganization at the federal level is practically impossible to implement at state and local levels. For example, in 34 States of our Country, CC (Crippled Childrens) Programs are located in and administered by State health departments. In most of these, the State MCH Director is also the State CC Director. How can one possibly anticipate a smooth functioning of state and local programs, under this proposed reorganization?

I understand that these questions and issues have evoked a large number of reactions and responses from all parts of our Country. Based on this, it would appear that much more thought, deliberation, and study of these and other aspects are strongly indicated before any further decisions are made. If I can be of any service in regard to this, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,  
HELEN M. WALLACE, M.D.,  
Professor and Chairman, Division of  
Material and Civil Health.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

~~NE~~  
ARAB NATIONS COMMITTING  
ATROCITIES AGAINST JEWS

(Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, while the chiefs of the Arab nations complain piteously of the fate that has befallen them as a consequence of their own aggression, they are themselves committing atrocities against mankind, the likes of which the world has not seen since the days of Nazi Germany. The Arabs are taking out their frustrations against the Jewish minorities that live in their own countries. The victims are Jews who had absolutely nothing to do with the recent Arab-Israel war. I feel that our own Government has given insufficient attention to this inhuman behavior. In an effort to be fair to all the parties in the recent war, our Government has somehow seen fit to pay no attention to the atrocities committed by one of the parties.

I am inserting into the RECORD a report of the statement from the Chief Rabbinate of Israel which describes this brutality, and I implore our Government to come to the aid of these innocent Jews, so that they may once again live in peace.

The Chief Rabbinate of Israel appealed today "to the conscience of all mankind" to demand an end to "the reign of black terror" that has been unleashed against the Jews in several Arab countries and for which the governments of those countries are held directly responsible.

The appeal, signed by Chief Rabbi Isser Untermann, will be distributed to thousands of churchmen, public figures and heads of humanitarian agencies. It details the "daily torture, beatings and humiliations" suffered by Jewish citizens of the Arab countries, often at the hands of former Nazis.

"All Jewish men in Egypt have been imprisoned, including the seriously ill," the

Chief Rabbinate declared. "In Cairo harsh restrictions have been imposed upon Jews who have not been imprisoned. Those that are imprisoned have had their hands and ribs broken, their hair shaven and their eyebrows pulled out. In some cases they are in the custody of ex-Nazis who have found a haven in Egypt."

"Synagogues have been seized and prayers proscribed. The Chief Rabbi of Alexandria is in prison and Cairo's Chief Rabbi is under house arrest as is the president of the Ashkenazi Jewish community. In Syria, Jewish quarters have been attacked by mobs and a curfew has been imposed on the ghettos which are threatened with starvation. Damascus Jews have been thrown out of their homes which have been given to Palestinians. In Iraq, dozens of Jews have been arrested on trumped up charges of spying for Israel and police have extorted money from Jews. The secret police has begun to threaten Jews with expropriating and murder."

"The severe loss of life, liberty and property sustained by Jews," the Chief Rabbinate's statement continued, "are the direct result of governmental responsibility. Attempts by international agencies to halt or a least modify the reign of terror have been contemptuously rebuffed by the Arab governments concerned. Therefore," the Chief Rabbinate stated, "we direct this passionate appeal from Jerusalem to the conscience of all mankind to raise its voice and demand instant action to stamp out this inhuman, cruel and uncivilized wave of oppression directed against our people by governments that give lip-service to the United Nations Charter."

(Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FARBSTEIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE FREEZING OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AND CIVILIAN CONSTRUCTION AWARDS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the actions by the Department of Defense which froze military construction contracts and the order from the Secretary of the Army which froze civilian construction awards affects every Member of this distinguished body.

For that reason, I would like to present in detail the facts which I brought out at a press conference on Wednesday, October 11, relative to this issue.

I called the press conference as a result of the colloquy which occurred between Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and me when he testified before the House Armed Services Committee last Tuesday to explain why these contracts have been frozen.

I insert here in the RECORD the content of my press conference which will speak for itself, beginning with my statement: